DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 459 EC 093 179

AUTHOR	Reiss, Philip
TITLE	Reading and Arithmetic for Mainstreaming Brain-Injured Children (School Year 1974-1975). Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[75]
NOTE	26p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Arithmetic; *City Wide Programs; Elementary Education; Exceptional Child Research; Learning Disabilities; *Minimally Brain Injured; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Reading; *Regular Class Placement; Special Programs
IDENTIFIERS	New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

Provided is an evaluation report of a special education program in New York City designed to improve the reading and arithmetic skills of brain-injured children in mainstream classes (grades 1 through 8). An assessment of the extent to which participants improved in reading and mathematics and a study of the extent to which the actual program coincided with the proposed program are noted to include the following findings: that children in grades 1-4 achieved statistically significant improvement in both reading and mathematics, that children in grades 7-8 achieved gains averaging 2.3 months in reading and 2.9 months in mathematics (these results were not statistically significant), and that observations indicated the program operated essentially as described in the proposal. Recommendations listed include provision of the program only in schools in which 10 or more eligible children have been identified, and simplification of procedures. (IM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136459

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09-58619

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EC TM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Reading and Arithmetic for Mainstreaming Brain-Injured Children (School Year 1974 - 1975)

Prepared by:
Philip Reiss

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1974-75 school year.

EC093179

2

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
List of Tables		iii
I	Program Description	1
II	Evaluative Procedures	4
III	Findings	6
IV	Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations	17
Appendix A:	Questionnaire Forms and MIR Items	22

List of Tables

Table		Page
I	Numbers of Students Tested	4
II	Mean Grade Level Equivalent Reading Scores on WRAT	8
III	Mean Grade Level Equivalent Mathematics Scores on WRAT	8

Chapter I

Program Description

This new special education program was designed to improve the reading and arithmetic skills of brain-injured children in mainstream classes. The major features of the program, as specified in the project proposal, are described below.

The major objective of the program was to provide individualized instruction to those children eligible for Title I benefits who had been diagnosed as brain-injured and learning disabled. Subsequently, the eligibility criteria were broadened to include children diagnosed as moderately language impaired. Additionally, elegibility criteria specified that children must be:

1. functioning one or more years below grade level in reading and/or arithmetic

2. diagnosed by the Evaluation & Placement Unit

3. recommended by the Evaluation & Placement Unit as being able to profit from itinerant instruction.

Individualized instruction in reading and arithmetic was provided by a special staff of itinerant teachers, selected on the basis of training, knowledge and interest in the learning disabled brain-injured child. Each teacher was to have a case load of approximately 30 children who were to receive itinerant instruction twice a week for an 8 to 10 week period. Instruction was on an individual basis except in situations in which similar goals allowed the formation of groups of two or three children.

Each teacher in the program was assigned to one of the nine city-wide Evaluation & Placement Units. The number of teachers

assigned to each Evaluation & Placement Unit depended upon the referral rate of children meeting the criteria for acceptance into this program at each Evaluation and Placement Unit.

Teaching materials and techniques were to follow the individualized prescription delineated in the Evaluation & Placement report that accompanied each child. Additional standardized or non-standardized testing was administered by the itinerant teacher as necessary. Lessons in reading and arithmetic were developed based on the child's strengths and weaknesses as reported in his Evaluation & Placement prescription. Special instructional materials were provided by the project.

A crucial aspect of the visits was to be consultation with classroom teachers. The role of the itinerant teacher was envisioned as not only that of a remediation expert, but also as a consultant to classroom teachers.

Paraprofessionals served as educational assistants and were under the direct supervision of the itinerant teachers to whom they were assigned. Their functions included assisting the teachers in implementing the remedial reading and arithmetic prescriptions, the preparation of materials and record keeping.

The supervisor (project coordinator), assisted by a teacher trainer, had the primary responsibility for the supervision of all staff members in the program. Each staff member was periodically observed and rated. Staff conferences and workshops were held at regular intervals. During such meetings new instructional methods and materials were disseminated and interesting individual cases were presented. Various staff members shared with their colleagues some of the techniques that they had found successful.

Visits for staff members to special education classes and Evaluation & Placement Units were arranged. This enabled them

to observe the entire referral procedure from the initial diagnosis to the final class placement. Outside consultants within and without the New York City Public School System were engaged to augment staff training. They lectured to the staff members on current research methods and techniques in the field of special education.

The program was city-wide in scope. The Evaluation and Placement Units were the primary sources of referral. Remediation was on an itinerant basis in each child's school. The program, staffed by a project coordinator (supervisor), a teacher trainer, 32 teachers, 17 paraprofessionals and 2 secretaries, served 510 children in 92 schools.

Because of variations in referral rates and screening procedures, it was not possible to assemble lists of eligible children sufficiently concentrated in single schools to warrant staffing by full time teachers. Thus, most teachers were given multiple school assignments, ranging from two to six schools, with an average of three schools per teacher. Case loads ranged from 11 to 22 children (average = 15.9). Each child received an average of 12 instructional sessions. The program began on February 18, 1975 with a two week period of in-service training and continued to the end of the school year.

Chapter II

Evaluative Procedures

The objectives of evaluation for this project were:

1. To assess the extent to which the participants have demonstrated statistically significant improvement in reading and mathematics.
2. To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the project proposal.

The first objective (extent of reading and arithmetic improvement) was carried out by administering the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) on a pre/post-test basis. Pre-testing was carried out in mid-March, shortly after the beginning of the program. Post-tests were administered during the last week in May.

Although all participants were to have been tested, it proved impossible to administer the test to 31 of the children (see Table 1). These included children who evidenced severe hearing losses, severe language problems or who were too immature to take the test. An additional 17 children did not receive the post-test because of transfers, discharges or chronic absenteeism. In all, 464 (91%) of the children who participated in the program received both a pre- and post-test; all of these scores were analyzed.

Table I

Numbers of Students Tested

Grade Group	Total N	N Tested	N not Tested/Analyzed	Causes for Missing Scores	
				Untestable	Absent
1-3	296	260	36	29	7
4-6	196	186	10	2	8
7-8	18	18	0	0	0
Total	510	464	46	31	15

Data were analyzed by the real (treatment) vs. anticipated (without treatment) design for standardized tests which yield grade level equivalents. Correlated t-tests, based on these differences, were computed.

The second objective (program implementation) was assessed through a series of visitations, interviews and mailed questionnaires (see Appendix A). The proposal projected two visits to each of the 30-35 schools in the project. However, since the program was actually carried out in 92 different schools, it was not possible to visit every school.

The mailed questionnaire was designed to supplement information obtained by the observations and interviews as well as to obtain information from schools which could not be visited. In addition, it was intended to obtain responses from approximately 10% of the regular classroom teachers of children served by this program.

Chapter III

Findings

The evaluation of this project was carried out by three strategies: standardized tests, administered on a pre/post basis; observations and interviews; and a questionnaire mailed in mid-May. The findings from each of these will be discussed in turn in this section.

Standardized Test Results

The first evaluation objective for this program was

> To assess the extent to which the participants have demonstrated statistically significant improvement in reading and mathematics.

The WRAT was administered on a pre/post test basis and grade level equivalent scores were analyzed by the historical regression formula. In most cases, tests were administered by the itinerant teacher. However, in a small number of cases (not more than 30), the pre-test score was taken from the Evaluation & Placement Unit report. This was done when the WRAT had been administered within the prior two months as part of an Evaluation & Placement Unit diagnostic battery. This procedure was adopted to avoid a possible inflation of pre-test scores due to overfamiliarity with test items. All post-testing was completed by the itinerant teachers during the last week of May.

After a predicted post-test score was computed for each pupil, the difference between that score and the pupil's actual post-test score was recorded. The mean difference for each grade group was then computed and a t-test was applied to appraise its statistical significance.

The results for all 464 students tested are reported in Tables II and III. The objective of statistically significant improvement in reading and mathematics was met by the students in grades one through six. The gains achieved by seventh and eighth grade students were not statistically significant. Thus, in light of this evidence, the program did not meet its goal for this group. This could be due to the small size of the group (18 students).

However, the program should not be judged to have been unsuccessful on behalf of this group of students. Their gains were greater than those which would have been predicted without the intervention. A more intensive intervention (perhaps three sessions weekly) or one which was conducted over a longer period of time might be needed by upper grade students who are, proportionately, further behind in achievement than younger students, in order to attain significant improvement.

Observation Findings

In order to achieve the second evaluation objective (extent of program implementation), the evaluator visited each of the 32 itinerant teachers in the program at least once; many teachers were visited twice, in different schools. During these visits, he observed the itinerant teacher (and paraprofessionals, if assigned) working with children and interviewed the principals or assistant principals and guidance counselors. The findings of these observations and interviews are presented in this section.

Actual scope of the program

The program was actually somewhat smaller than provided by the proposal. Instead of 40 teachers and 20 paraprofessionals serving

Table II

Mean Grade Level Equivalent Reading Scores on WRAT

Grade Group	N	Pre-Test Mean (3/75)	Predicted Post-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean (5/75)	Difference	t
1-3	296	1.71	1.90	1.96	.06	3.93*
4-6	196	2.88	2.98	3.24	.26	6.54*
7-8	18	3.38	3.45	3.61	.16	1.19**

Table III

Mean Grade Level Equivalent Mathematics Scores on WRAT

Grade Group	N	Pre-Test Mean (3/75)	Predicted Post-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean (5/75)	Difference	t
1-3	296	1.92	2.11	2.27	.16	4.73*
4-6	196	3.31	3.46	3.75	.29	8.54*
7-8	18	3.73	3.84	4.02	.18	0.81**

*$p \leq .001$

**$p \leq .15$, not significant

1200 students in 30 schools there were only 32 teachers and 17 paraprofessionals serving 510 students in 92 schools. One teacher line was used to employ a teacher trainer. The proposal provided for a psychologist, guidance counselor and social worker. However, it did not prove possible to employ properly qualified individuals for those positions.

A number of factors may account for these differences in size. First, funding delayed the onset of the program from January to mid-February. This created difficulty with staff recruitment. It also meant that only a single ten week remediation cycle was possible during the remainder of the school year. Second, it appears that no identification of eligible cases was made in advance of the start of the program. It was not possible to rapidly provide the numbers of referrals, in concentrated locations, which had been projected. This reduced both the total number of children served by the program and the number which could be served by each itinerant teacher. In place of a team of two itinerant teachers and one paraprofessional serving 60 to 70 children in a school, single teachers travelled to as many as six different schools per week, often to serve one or two children at each site. The many problems created by this dispersal will be discussed in later sections.

Many of the children actually served in the program were on waiting lists for special class placements; a few were transferred during the program. Although the proposal did not include such children, the criteria were relaxed to enable more children to qualify and to provide some service to children who were receiving little or no instruction while awaiting placement.

Observations of Program Activities

The initial orientation and in-service training sessions, conducted by the project coordinator, the teacher trainer and by

outside consultants, were found to be very well organized and informative. Presentations covered theoretical bases of teaching learning disabled and brain-injured children as well as very practical, detailed instructions on implementing the program.

The initiation of the program in the schools was frequently delayed. Many principals would not permit itinerant teachers to begin observing children in classrooms before parent notification letters had been sent. In a number of other instances, the Evaluation & Placement Units had not completed screening students.

Once children were identified, teachers set up their schedules and began to see children regularly. Space in which to work was seldom readily available. However, schools which were assigned full time teachers or to which teachers were assigned two full days weekly often provided a room for the itinerant teacher. Those schools receiving the service for half-days (or less) were more likely to require the itinerant teacher to work in a hallway, auditorium or to share space with some other teacher. The availability of a stable work space and/or storage area often, in turn, determined the availability of instructional materials.

A wide variety of attractive, appropriate instructional materials was purchased for this program. Additional supplies were made available for the preparation of original materials. The emphasis in material selection appears to have been upon flexibility, high interest and broad range of applicability.

Despite limitations imposed by their itinerant status, teachers generally made good use of instructional aids. Children were exposed to a variety of materials in each session, often selected to provide multisensory experiences for the same content. One teacher used student prepared original captioned film strips as

a device for teaching sight vocabulary.

Written plans for instructional sessions were always in evidence; folders were maintained for every child. Some teachers developed attractive, interesting charts to document children's progress. These permitted students to record their own progress and were used as room displays. Almost all instructional sessions were individualized. Only rarely did teachers find it possible to organize groups of two or three. This reflected the heterogeneity that was found in most schools.

Children were generally seen for two 45 minute sessions weekly. Some children might be seen for more, but shorter, sessions. A small number of children were seen for less time. Each session was divided among several short instructional periods, capitalizing upon variety as a technique to focus student attention.

The paraprofessionals were generally involved in escorting children to and from regular classrooms, record keeping and preparation of instructional materials. About half of the paraprofessionals shared some of the instructional responsibilities. In at least two instances, the teacher conducted all reading instruction while the paraprofessional conducted mathematics instruction. Most of the teachers evidenced interest in and, indeed, attempted to encourage the paraprofessionals to further develop their skills.

The children served by the program appeared to enjoy their sessions. With only one or two exceptions, all willingly came for the tutorial when called. Children were observed to work well during their sessions and a friendly, trusting relationship between children and itinerant teachers was often noted. Many children were observed to visit the itinerant teachers between scheduled sessions, to confirm the time of the next session, to ask for an extra session or just to say "Hello".

Interview Findings

Interviews with Administrators

Administrators were often very supportive of the concept of mainstreaming. They were eager to be able to retain children within their home schools while providing supportive services. Generally favorable comments about the program were volunteered.

Many administrators expressed concern over the manner in which children were selected for this program. Generally, they indicated that for maximum effectiveness this service should be provided as early as possible, before a child had necessarily been designated for special class placement. Most administrators believed it would be possible to maintain brain-injured learning disabled children in the mainstream with this form of assistance. Further, they felt that the school could play a more active role in identifying such children. Many also emphasized that a part-time itinerant teacher could not be a substitute for special class placement for more severely handicapped children.

Several of the administrators were eager to obtain an itinerant teacher assigned full time to their school. They indicated that this would strengthen the program by making it better known and better accepted within the school. This would also offer more opportunities for in-service sessions for their own teachers.

However, particularly in regard to the latter, a number of administrators expressed concern about the experience and/or knowledgeableness of the itinerant teacher. If the itinerant teacher is to provide recommendations to regular classroom teachers, they felt that this person must be perceived by classroom teachers as a knowledgeable expert.

Another area of great concern to administrators was the title

of the program. Administrators reflected a desire to avoid labelling, in any fashion, children who are to be mainstreamed. This was seen to be particularly important in presenting the program to teachers and parents. Therefore, more than half of the schools requested that parent notices be sent on school letterhead, rather than project letterhead.

Interviews with Teachers

Teachers were generally pleased with the in-service training they had received. Most also felt that there was a good variety of materials available. However, those assigned to several schools often remarked about the problems related to this.

Teachers' reactions to the Evaluation & Placement Units' reports were mixed. Approximately one-third of the teachers reported obtaining educational reports for all their children at or near the beginning of the program. Many reported that evaluations were incomplete or reports unavailable, even as late as the end of May.

When reports were available, some teachers found them to be very helpful. Others stated that all reports contained approximately the same suggestions. Teachers who were less familiar with technical terminology encountered more difficulty in interpreting Evalutation & Placement Unit reports. All teachers felt a need to carry out some additional testing on their own.

Teachers' caseloads varied from 11 to 22 with an average of 15.9 children per teacher. This was achieved after some shifting of children and school assignments, as new cases were identified. This figure compared favorably with the maximum possible caseload of 17 (based upon 2 sessions weekly per child, allowing 7 instructional periods per day of 45 minutes each); higher figures indicate group instruction and/or the assistance of a paraprofessional.

The itinerant teachers' reports of communication with regular classroom teachers and administrators indicated a generally positive perception of the program. Classroom teachers' attitudes were represented as ranging from relief at having the child out of the room for some time to a high degree of interest in working with the itinerant teachers to help the child. Meetings were difficult to arrange; itinerant teachers who were full time in a single school were more often able to meet regularly with classroom teachers.

A sample of classroom teachers (approximately 20) was interviewed during school visits in May (responses of others were obtained on a mailed questionnaire, discussed below). These teachers offered generally positive comments, indicating that their children were seen regularly by the itinerant teacher and that the service was worthwhile.

Itinerant teachers were generally very enthusiastic about the program and eager to share reports of children's progress. They felt that more information from the Evaluation & Placement Units, available at an earlier date, would have helped a great deal. Teachers regretted not being assigned to single schools. The interviews indicated that the teachers were serious, concerned about the children assigned to them and open to suggestions for improving their own work.

Interviews with Paraprofessionals

Each of the 17 paraprofessionals was interviewed during the school visits. All but three were assigned to work full time with one teacher; six of them were full time in a single school. Less than half of the paraprofessionals reported previous experience or education related to their current assignment. However, many did hold B.A. degrees and some had teaching licenses. While there seemed to be some initial uncertainty concerning an appropriate role for the paraprofessionals, by late May all teachers and paraprofessionals

appeared to have established mutually satisfying work relationships.

The paraprofessionals were very positive about the benefits of the program. Many spoke approvingly of the supervision given by their teachers and of the progress of their children. Their level of concern and professionalism was quite impressive.

Questionnaire Survey Findings

In mid-May, specially constructed questionnaires were sent to each of the schools participating in the program. One was addressed to the school principal (or guidance counselor responsible for the program) and one was to go to one classroom teacher. These questionnaires were an addition to the evaluation design, intended to sample responses from as many schools served by the program as possible.

Principals' Responses

Twenty-nine of the 92 principals (32%) responded to a six item questionnaire. This group reported that an average of 5.6 children in their schools had been recommended and eligible for the program and that an average of 5.2 children had actually been served in each school. These numbers agree with program records.

Twenty of the principals indicated that the program assisted in mainstreaming the children served while only four said it did not do so. Five replied that they could not judge, noting that the program had been in operation for too short a time.

Although only four principals reported attending a workshop or other meeting about the project, all but one indicated that there was good communication between project and school staff.

Finally, 20 principals reported favorable parental responses and five reported neutral responses; none of the principals reported any instance of negative parental response.

Classroom Teachers' Responses

Classroom teachers were asked to respond to a nine item, essentially multiple-choice questionnaire. Responses were obtained from 59 teachers in 27 different schools. The goal of obtaining a sample of at least 10% of the teachers was thus met.

The overwhelming majority of teachers reported that only one child in their class was served by the program. A small number indicated that two to four children were served. Children were seen quite regularly, for 45 minutes to an hour for each session; only seven teachers report fewer than two sessions weekly.

Meetings with itinerant teachers appear to have varied: 27 teachers reported frequent meetings, 25 reported that they seldom met and 7 reported that they never met. Eighteen of the teachers also reported attending a workshop conducted by the project staff. Only one indicated a visit to a special education facility as a result of participation in the project.

Eighteen teachers noted an improvement in academic work and 14 noted an improvement in behavior (some noted both). At least four teachers wrote that the project had been of too short a duration to enable them to observe such changes. Only 23 teachers reported no change in the children served by the program.

Chapter IV

Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

Major Findings

Scope of Project

Five hundred ten children in grades 1-8 received individualized instruction in reading and arithmetic. Each child was seen for an average of two 45 minute periods for 8 to 10 weeks. The service was provided by a staff of 32 teachers and 17 paraprofessionals supervised by a project coordinator and a teacher trainer.

Children were served in 92 schools throughout the city. All children met the eligibility criteria set forth in the proposal. However, about half had been recommended for and were awaiting special class placement.

Standardized Test Results

The WRAT was administered to 464 of the children served by the program on a pre/post-test basis. Children in grades 1-4 achieved statistically significant improvement in both reading and mathematics. Children in grades 7-8 achieved average gains of 2.3 months in reading and 2.9 months in math; these gains were not statistically significant.

Observation, Interview & Questionnaire Findings

Observations indicated that the program operated essentially as described in the proposal. The staff was found to be highly motivated and hard working. Their efforts were supported by the expertise and leadership of the project coordinator and teacher trainer.

Teachers were generally well prepared by the in-service program to implement the instructional components of this program. Limitations in consultation with classroom teachers were noted.

The children appeared to enjoy and profit from the tutorial sessions. Further, there was support and encouragement of the program by administrators, guidance counselors and classroom teachers.

The unavailability and/or incompleteness of reports from Evaluation & Placement Units placed limits on the program. Small numbers of referrals, scattered among large numbers of schools, resulted in a program that was more dispersed than had been planned. Teachers who travelled among as many as six different schools were forced to carry a much smaller case load than those serving only one or two schools.

Further effects of this dispersal were seen in the space made available to itinerant teachers and the materials used by the teachers. Those teachers who served several schools generally had less adequate (and less dependable) working space and were more limited in the materials they could carry than were those teachers who worked in one or two schools.

Instructional materials contributed to the success of this program. The variety of items prepared by the staff to supplement commerical materials was impressive. Many of these original materials were designed to meet the special needs of particular children.

Information from both Evaluation & Placement Units' reports and the teachers' own testing was used to plan individualized instructional programs for the children. Record forms were used to enable teachers to document instruction, evaluate progress and note and treat any weaknesses.

The program was perceived positively by school administrators, classroom teachers and parents. There was a high level of commitment to the concept of mainstreaming and concomitant concern over the title of this program. More than half of the classroom teachers who responded to a mailed questionnaire reported improvements in children served by the program.

Conclusions

The program appears to have been implemented essentially as described in the proposal and to have essentially achieved its major objectives.

The brief duration of the service, occurring late in the school year, may account for its limited impact upon student achievement (notably the scores of 7th and 8th grade students). A longer period of instruction and/or more intensive instruction might improve gains.

The limited impact may also be related to the small degree of carryover to students' classrooms. There were relatively irregular contacts between itinerant teachers and classroom teachers in many instances. Although included in the proposal, there were relatively few workshops for classroom teachers. Thus, the absence of an exchange of information and techniques, which might have enhanced program effectiveness, likely had a negative effect. Further, the itinerant teachers limited backgrounds made them less credible to the classroom teachers as authorities in learning disabilities.

This program was designed to serve children whose learning disabilities were mild enough to make mainstreaming possible. An additional limitation may have unwittingly been placed upon the program by the inclusion of children awaiting special class placement. Their inclusion was a source of concern to administrators and classroom teachers. That is, they did not wish to see this program as a substitute for special class placement for children requiring it.

The diffusion of the program among many schools limited the possible impact within any one school. Teachers serving several schools were not likely to be perceived as part of the faculty. Often, they were unable to obtain storage space or a regular space in which to work. Contacts with school faculty were generally meager in these situations. The situation was much more satisfactory

when a teacher was assigned to only one or two schools.

A major set of problems in program implementation appears to be related to the procedure whereby the Evaluation & Placement Units are responsible for referrals and diagnoses. These referrals were a major basis for entry into the program and the Evaluation & Placement Units' reports were the primary source of information upon which individualized programs were to be developed. Deficiencies in both the number of referrals and the quality of the reports seriously affected the program.

Many of the administrators indicated that they would like increased involvement at the school level in referring children to this program. Further, they expressed some conviction that it should be possible for the school guidance counselor and school psychologist to develop procedures to obtain required diagnosis. In this way it was felt children could be served earlier in their school careers, before problems became severe enough to require special class placement.

Finally, there was great concern over the title of the program. The juxtaposition of the terms "mainstreaming" and "learning disabled brain-injured children" was seen as negative by many administrators and teachers. Most were concerned about the possible reactions of parents and children. The consensus was to avoid labelling the handicapping condition as long as there is a possibility of mainstreaming.

Recommendations

This program should be continued next year since it has resulted in significant student gain and has assisted in mainstreaming a number of children who have been labelled as learning disabled and brain-injured. The following suggestions are offered to help improve the operation of the program:

1. Provide the program only in schools in which 10 or more eligible children have been identified. This will enable the assignment of teachers full-time (or at least for two full days) to participating schools.

2. Simplify the procedures by which children are identified as eligible for the program. While full clinical evaluations are important, their absence should not deny a child access to a needed service.

3. Increase the role of school staff in identifying children eligible for this program.

4. Restrict eligibility for the program to children for whom mainstreaming has been recommended; children awaiting special class placements should not be included.

5. Replacement and/or additional staff selection should be based on experience and knowledge in the education of learning disabled brain-injured children.

6. Increase the opportunities for teacher consultation and in-service meetings by including some time allocation for such activities in itinerant teachers' schedules.

7. Change the title of the program to avoid attaching labels with negative connotations to children served. A neutral label, such as "Supportive Reading & Arithmetic" might be considered.

8. Extend the duration of the program and begin it as early as possible in the school year.

Appendix A:

Questionnaire Forms and MIR Items

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES
TITLE I
READING & ARITHMETIC FOR MAINSTREAMING BRAIN INJURED CHILDREN
P.S. 93 — 1535 STORY AVENUE
BRONX, NEW YORK 10472
TELEPHONE: 589-7181

MARGARET REEHILL
COORDINATOR

Questionnaire for School Principals (or Designated Guidance Counselor)

The Reading and Arithmetic for Mainstreaming Project is being evaluated for Office of Educational Evaluation. Your responses to the questions below are essential for this study. They will be given full consideration and neither you nor your school will be identified in connection with them.

Please answer all the questions, checking your answers where response choices are indicated. Please feel free to add further comments on the reverse of the sheet. In addition, enclosed is a second questionnaire to be completed by any one regular classroom teacher of a child who has received service from this program.

Thank you for your cooperation.

1. School number _____ (for verification of coverage only)

2. How many children in your school were recommended and eligible for this program? _____

3. How many children in your school were actually served by this program? _____

4. Did the program assist in maintaining any child within his regular class or help in returning a child from a special class to the regular grades? Yes_____ No_____

5. Do you feel that there was good communication between members of the project staff and your school staff? Yes_____ No_____

6. Has any member of the project staff conducted a workshop or other meeting to inform your school staff of the techniques used in the project? Yes_____ No_____

7. What were the parents' responses to this project?
Favorable_____ Neutral_____ Unfavorable_____

Please return the completed forms within 5 days to: Dr. Philip Reiss
Evaluation Consultant
1030 E. 27 St.
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11210

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES
TITLE I
READING & ARITHMETIC FOR MAINSTREAMING BRAIN INJURED CHILDREN
P.S. 93 — 1535 STORY AVENUE
BRONX, NEW YORK 10472
TELEPHONE: 589-7181

MARGARET REEHILL
COORDINATOR

Questionnaire for Classroom Teachers

The Reading and Arithmetic for Mainstreaming Project is being evaluated for the Office of Educational Evaluation. Your responses to the questions below are essential for this study. They will be given full consideration and neither you nor your school will be identified in connection with them.

Please answer all the questions, checking your answers where response choices are indicated. Please feel free to add further comments on the reverse of the sheet.

Thank you for your cooperation.

1. School number _____ (for verification of coverage only)
2. How many children in your class were recommended and eligible for this program? _____
3. How many children in your class were actually served by this program? _____
4. How ofen was each child seen by the itinerant teacher, on the average
   Once a week____ Twice a week____ More than twice a week____
5. How long were the sessions?_____
6. Did the itinerant teacher meet with you to exchange information about the children in the program?
   Frequently_____ Seldom_____ Not at all_____
7. What were the parents' responses to this program?
   Favorable_____ Neutral_____ Unfavorable_____
8. Did you attend a workshop or other meeting at which a member of the project staff discussed project activities? Yes____ No____
9. Have you visited an Evaluation and Placement Unit or other special education facility as a result of participation in this project?
   Yes_____ No_____
10. Have you noticed any change in the children who have been served by this program?
    Academic work improved_____ Behavior improved____
    No change observed_____

Please return the completed form within 5 days to: Dr. Philip Reiss
Evaluation Consultant
1030 E. 27 St.
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11210

Use Table 30A. for Historical Regression Design (6-Step Formula) for Reading (English); Math (English); Reading (Non-English); Math (Non-English).

30A. Standardized Test Results.

In the Table below, enter the requested information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. This form requires means obtained from scores in the form of grade equivalent units as processed by the 6 step formula (see District Evaluator's Handbook of Selected Evaluation Procedures, p. 45-49). Before completing this table, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used[1]	Form		Level		Total N[2]	Group I.D.[3]	Number Tested[4]	Pretest		Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest		Statistical Data	
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post				Date	Mean		Date	Mean	Obtained Value of t	Level[5] of significance
6 0 8 1 3	7 2 2	WRAT	1	1			296	13	260	3/75	1.71	1.90	5/75	1.96	3.93	p≤.001
6 0 9 1 3	7 2 2	WRAT	1	1			296	13	260	3/75	1.92	2.11	5/75	2.27	4.73	p≤.001
6 0 8 1 4	7 2 2	WRAT	1	1			196	14	186	3/75	2.88	2.98	5/75	3.24	6.54	p≤.001
6 0 9 1 4	7 2 2	WRAT	1	1			196	14	186	3/75	3.31	3.46	5/75	3.75	8.54	p≤.001
6 0 8 1 5	7 2 2	WRAT	1	1			18	15	18	3/75	3.38	3.45	5/75	3.61	1.19	p≤.15
6 0 9 1 5	7 2 2	WRAT	1	1			18	15	18	3/75	3.73	3.84	5/75	4.02	0.81	p≤.25

1/ Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-58, CAT-70, etc.).
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.
5/ Specify level of statistical significance obtained (e.g., $p \leq .05$; $p \leq .01$).

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #09-58619

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
						N	%		
60813	722	13	WRAT	296	260	36	12%	Untestable, too immature, lang. hearing loss	29
60913	722	13						Trans. absent, disch. on post-test	7
60814	722	14	WRAT	196	186	10	5%	Untestable	2
60914	722	14						Trans, disch. absent on post-test	8

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combi enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further spa needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

ED136455

EC093179

26